

## REMARKS

### Summary of the Office Action

Claims 10 and 13-21 were pending in the above-identified patent application.

Claims 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, and 20 have been indicated to be allowable.

Claims 17 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 15 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,404,074 ("Watanabe") in view of Speigel et al. U.S. Patent No. 3,763,051 ("Speigel").

### Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claims 10, 13, 14, 16, 18, and 20.

Applicants have amended claim 17 to correct a minor typographical error. Applicants have canceled claims 15 and 21 without prejudice.

The Examiner's claim rejection under section 112 is respectfully traversed.

### The Section 112 Rejection

Claims 17 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner contends that the recitation of "and/or semiconductive" in claims 17 and 19 "renders the claims indefinite since the previous claim states that the binder is conductive" (Office Action, page 2, lines 14 and 15). Applicants respectfully disagree.

It is well known that, by applying heat, a material having certain properties may yield one or more products having different properties than the material. In accordance with this basic principle, and as set forth in claims 17 and 19, by heating a binder material that includes conductive material, a semiconductive oxide may be formed (claim 17), or a semiconducting

oxide may be left behind (claim 19). Applicants' specification also sets forth that "a simple heating process removes the organics and leaves behind a conducting or semiconducting oxide which binds the phosphor particles to each other and to the glass screen" (page 4, lines 6-8). Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 17 and 19 are not indefinite, and therefore the Examiner's rejection of these claims under section 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

#### The Section 103 Rejection

Claims 15 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Speigel. Applicants respectfully disagree with the contentions made by the Examiner in the Office Action in connection with this rejection. However, to facilitate allowance, applicants have canceled claims 15 and 21 without prejudice. Nothing in this response should be interpreted as applicants' acquiescence to, or agreement with, the Examiner's rejection under section 103.

#### Conclusion

The foregoing demonstrates that claims 10, 13, 14, and 16-20 are patentable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

#### Authorization

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this Reply, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Director is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

Respectfully submitted,  
Wilmer Cutler Pickering  
Hale and Dorr LLP

Date: 3/29/05

  
Laura A. Paquette  
Registration No. 48,446  
Agent for Applicants

Wilmer Cutler Pickering  
Hale and Dorr LLP  
Customer No. 28089  
399 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
Tel: 212-230-8800  
Fax: 212-230-8888